

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

SPECIFICATION

The Abstract has been amended to overcome the objection raised by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 8 and 10-22 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Gortz et al. (US 6,629,183) in view of Nagasaka et al. (US 7,010,756) and further in view of Bramesfeld et al. (US 6,140,593).

The newly Nagasaka et al. reference discloses a touch-screen remote control device 90 for transmitting selection instructions wirelessly to a navigation system, having a display screen 86 that displays the results of the selections made via the remote control device. Hence, the Nagasaka et al. remote control device is essentially no different from a remote control for a digital flat screen TV that is used to select from various menu screens that can be brought up on the TV screen for programming purposes, changing the color, tint, brightness, etc. of the picture, and other such functions.

The Examiner suggests that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gortz et al. in view of Nagasaka et al. so that the transmitting units in Gortz et al. (i.e., keypad 12.1; microphone 12.2 and corresponding A/D converter 26; and video camera 12.3 and its corresponding A/D converter 26) transmit control signals containing "identification information".

This assertion, however, from a technical standpoint makes absolutely no sense. As previously noted in the Remarks contained in the Response filed October 2, 2006, the design of the interface in Gortz et al. requires that the keypad 12.1 is connected to the tactile driver interface 21, the microphone 12.2 is connected to the audio driver interface 22, and the camera 12.3 is connected to the video driver interface. What then would possibly motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the camera 12.3, for example, in Gortz et al. to add identification information to the video data transmitted to the video driver interface 23 for the purpose of informing the video driver interface that the incoming data is video data from a camera, when the video driver interface 23 already "knows" this because it is only designed to receive video data from a camera? In other words, by virtue of the fact that the various interface circuits 21, 22 and 23 can only be connected to one particular type of input device -- i.e., the connections of the various input/output devices are not interchangeable as the Examiner readily admits -- there is absolutely no need to transmit an identification signal that uniquely identifies the particular device.

Moreover, the teaching of Bramesfeld et al. does not assist in this regard because one cannot simply rearrange the input/output devices in Gortz et al. and have


the interface function properly. As noted above, the various input/output devices in Gortz et al. can only be connected one way; they are not interchangeable and Bramesfeld et al. does not teach how the Gortz et al. interface device could possibly be modified to make the devices interchangeable.

In short, the interface system taught by Gortz et al. is simply not susceptible to the types of modifications suggested by the Examiner. To do so would render the interface device completely inoperable. It goes without saying that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify a device so as to render it inoperable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that pending Claims 1-14 define patentable subject matter and are therefore in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 21, 2008

By: 
Christopher M. Brock
Reg. No. 27313

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CMB/bh